DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 745 CS 010 713

AUTHOR Campbell, Tim K.
TITLE Reading Interest and Achievement: What Are the Implications for Male Disabled Readers?
PUB DATE Dec 90
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Reading Forum (11th, Sarasota, FL, December 12-15, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Research; Elementary Education; *Males; Qualitative Research; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Attitudes; Reading Difficulties; *Reading Interests; Reading Research; *Remedial Reading; Research Methodology
IDENTIFIERS Oklahoma (Central)

ABSTRACT

A study examined the relationship between reading interest and achievement of male disabled readers. Subjects, 30 males aged 8 to 12 years and identified as disabled readers, were selected from a metropolitan school district in central Oklahoma. Subjects completed a reading interest questionnaire and a standardized reading test. The five subjects identified as having the lowest measures in reading interest and reading achievement were chosen for qualitative analysis which included classroom observation in the regular classroom and in the reading disability lab. Observations occurred over a 5-week period. Classroom observations indicated that: (1) while relatively little time was spent reading, all of the subjects indicated that reading was an important factor in all of life; (2) talking was observed, yet subjects commented that they did not want to share books orally to their classmates; (3) little movement to the bookshelf was apparent, yet reading was deemed important; (4) subjects were inattentive to books and reading material; (5) all subjects said that the one thing they could do better in reading was to read; and (6) a relationship between reading interest and reading achievement was indicated. Findings indicated that male disabled readers showed no significant relationship between reading interest and achievement when performing pencil and paper tasks to measure such a relationship. (Three tables of data and the questions used in the exit interview are included; 24 references, a list of the categories for interactive analysis, and the exit interview schedule are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED337745

READING INTEREST AND ACHIEVEMENT
WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR MALE DISABLED READERS?

TIM K. CAMPBELL, Ed.D.
SOUTHERN NAZARENE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL *OF EDUCATION*
6729 N.W. 39TH EXPRESSWAY
BETHANY, OKLAHOMA 73008
(405) 789-6400 #6426

CS010713

PAPER PRESENTATION
THE ELEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING
AMERICAN READING FORUM

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jim Campbell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

READING INTEREST AND ACHIEVEMENT
WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR MALE DISABLED READERS?

INTRODUCTION

How important is reading interest to reading achievement? If a reader is interested in reading materials of his choosing, does this behavior have impact on achievement? What *kinds* of interest do boys who are disabled readers ages eight to twelve have in reading materials? Such questions are worthy of consideration when thinking about ways to meet the needs of male disabled readers in reading instruction.

Much work done in reading research in the past decade has centered on the cognitive domain. Research in this area as it impacts reading instruction has led to a better understanding and knowledge of how students comprehend text (Duffy, 1986). The area of research in reading interest and motivation is where more emphasis is needed (Ruddell, 1990).

Since, 1899, reading interest has been researched heavily and is of prime concern to reading educators (Weintraub, 1977). Many studies have been made to determine what kinds of book choices and interests children have in reading. Such studies have suggested that a relationship exists between interest and achievement (Bruneau, 1986). Other studies have focused on the relationship of gender and reading interest (Howe, 1963; King, 1967, Johnson and Greenbaum, 1982). The number studies on the relationship between reading interest and achievement among male disabled readers is limited.

In many elementary classrooms and reading clinics, males with reading problems comprise a large population (Blom, 1971; Putnam City Schools, 1990). Samuels and Turnure (1974) suggest that males are less attentive during reading instruction, and this in turn could lead to a lack of attention and interest in reading.

Researchers in reading have suggested a relationship between reading interest and achievement. Some are still unclear to what extent this does occur (Bruneau, 1986). The literature suggests that males with reading problems have little or no interest in reading (Asher, 1980 and Campbell, 1990). Interest in reading can be considered one of the most important and crucial variables that impact upon a readers

learning and reaction to text (DeBeaugrande, 1982). Brewer (1983) suggests that interest is a major part not only in motivation, but in reading comprehension and recall of text. The purpose of this study was to describe the relationship between reading interest and achievement of male disabled readers ages eight to twelve.

METHOD

Subjects

The sample for this study consisted of thirty male students ages eight to twelve. The subjects were selected from a metropolitan school district in central Oklahoma. The sample met the criteria for a disabled reader as set forth by the school district.

Materials

The Dulin-Chester Reading Interest Questionnaire (1979) and the Gates -MacGinitie Reading Test (1989) were the instruments administered in the spring of 1990.

Procedure

The testing session using the Dulin-Chester Reading Interest Questionnaire was administered in the following matter:

" Some of us like to read a lot and others don't, but all of us read at least sometimes for one reason or another. That's what this questionnaire is all about: why

people read. To show how you feel about reading, grade each question with a(n) A, B, C, D, and E. Remembering A is the highest grade and E is the lowest."

Next, the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test was administered in the following manner:

First, the subjects took the vocabulary section, then the comprehension section. Specific instructions were included in the testing manual.

After the quantitative data was collected, five subjects of the sample of thirty were chosen for qualitative analysis. The five subjects chosen were identified as having the lowest measures in reading interest and reading achievement from the testing session previously mentioned. The qualitative analysis included classroom observations of the five subjects in both the regular classroom and reading disability lab using Flanders Interactive Analysis (1979) as a model for the observation sessions. The observations occurred over a five week period on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday for 45- minute sessions. The following procedure was used for this part of the data collection:

The five subjects were coded with the first five letters of the alphabet in the following manner:

Subject	Code
4	A
20	B
29	C
21	D
22	E

Event sampling was employed as the method for collecting the observations. In using event sampling, the researcher waited for selected behaviors to occur and recorded the behaviors. The use of event sampling is to very clearly identify the observed classroom behaviors. The behaviors used are listed in Appendix A.

In order to insure reliability of the list of behaviors, the formula by Emmer and Millet (1970) was employed. Below is the formula that was employed:

$$\text{Agreement} = 1 - \frac{A-B}{A+B}$$

Reliability was established with 96 percent accuracy. The reading coordinator from the school district where the investigation took place, was employed to establish interobserver reliability.

At the end of the classroom observations an exit interview was adminstered to the five subjects. The interview schedule is in Appendix B. The interviews acquired information about the subjects' perception of their reading interest and reading behavior. The questions were generated around the four major categories as suggested by Strauss, Schatzman, Bucher, and Sabshin (1981). Figure 1 illustrates the four categories.

TREATMENT AND RESULTS

QUANTITATIVE DATA

The Spearman-Rank Correlation Coefficient was calculated to test significance. The test revealed a nonsignificant relationship for each comparison. Table I illustrates the relationships.

QUALITATIVE DATA

It should be noted to see what the daily part of a particular school program is really all about it is important to make classroom observations. Duffy (1982) suggests that studies that leave out or omit observations have little chance to make a contribution to an understanding of the process. The use of Interactive Analysis was employed during the classroom observations. The results of both observations in the regular classroom

and the reading disabilities lab is listed in Table II and III.

The classroom observations and the exit interviews reveal some interesting considerations:

1. For the most part, relatively little time was spent reading. But all of the subjects indicated that reading was and important factor in all of life.

2. A large percentage of the qualitative analysis indicated that talking was exhibited during the classroom observations. The subjects though commented that they didn't want to share about books orally to their classmates.

3. Little movement to the bookshelf to get reading materials was apparent, but reading was still deemed to be important.

4. A fairly good percentage of the time observed indicated that the subjects were inattentive to books and reading material. This seemed to reflect in low achievememt in reading.

5. All the subjects in the study said that the one thing they could do better in reading was to read.

6. Finally, the qualitative analysis suggests that a relationship between reading interest and reading achievement was indicated. Little time reading, talking in

class, not choosing materials, and inattentiveness to books and reading materials leads to conclude such a relationship.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study indicate agreement with previous research that questioned the notion of the reliability and validity of interest attainment through interest inventories and questionnaires (Terman and Lima, 1926; Norvell, 1950). The findings of this study are inconsistent with previous research related to the relationship between reading interest and achievement (Bernstein, 1955; Shnayer, 1968; Vaughn, 1975; Belloni and Jongsma, 1975; and Bruneau, 1986). This study indicated quantitatively that male disabled readers showed no significant relationship between reading interest and achievement when performing pencil and paper tasks to measure such a relationship.

It appears, that when using qualitative measures, a relationship between reading interest and achievement can be suggested. Stanchfield (1962) reported that using interviews was a good method to determine interest. This study confirms that research. This study suggests that in determining reading interest for male disabled readers, classroom observations and interviews should be employed.

FOUR QUESTIONS

- Hypothetical Question: asks what the respondent might do or what it might be like in a particular situation; it usually begins with "what."
- Devil's Advocate Questions: challenges the respondent to consider an opposing view.
- Ideal Position Questions: asks the respondent to describe an ideal situation.
- Interpretive Question: advances tentative interpretation of what the respondent has said and asks for a reaction.

Figure 1. Four Types of Questions

RELATIONSHIPS WITH INTEREST AS A REWARD

Variables	Spearman-Rank	Sign.
Vocabulary	-.01253	NS
Comprehension	.1798	NS
Total Reading	.07953	NS

RELATIONSHIPS WITH INTEREST AS A RESULT OF TEACHER ENCOURAGEMENT

Variables	Spearman-Rank	Sign.
Vocabulary	.1022	NS
Comprehension	.01262	NS
Total Reading	.08574	NS

RELATIONSHIPS WITH INTEREST AS A RESULT OF FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

Variables	Spearman-Rank	Sign.
Vocabulary	-.17673	NS
Comprehension	-.14491	NS
Total Reading	-.14329	NS

RELATIONSHIPS WITH INTEREST AS A RESULT OF ENRICHMENT

Variables	Spearman-Rank	Sign.
Vocabulary	-.00883	NS
Comprehension	-.02509	NS
Total Reading	-.00403	NS

TABLE II

AVERAGE PERCENTAGES OF OBSERVED BEHAVIOR IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOM

OBSERVED BEHAVIORS FROM INTERACTION ANALYSIS	STUDENTS A	B	C	D	E
1. Going to Bookshelf	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2. Book and Reading Material	15%	24%	36%	9%	31%
3. Book Reading-Teacher Initiated	0%	2%	0%	4%	0%
4. Book Reading-Student Initiated	12%	3%	3%	6%	28%
5. Student Talk-Response	17%	12%	12%	33%	2%
6. Student Talk	21%	28%	17%	8%	8%
7. Out of Seat	13%	4%	1%	2%	2%
8. Leaving the Room	1%	0%	0%	0%	2%
9. Teacher Involvement	12%	15%	12%	25%	12%
10. Miscellaneous	7%	12%	19%	13%	15%

TABLE III

AVERAGE PERCENTAGES OF OBSERVED BEHAVIOR IN THE READING DISABILITY LAB

OBSERVED BEHAVIORS FROM INTERACTION ANALYSIS	STUDENTS A	B	C	D	E
1. Going to Bookshelf	4%	4%	4%	0%	1%
2. Book and Reading Material	27%	13%	10%	8%	7%
3. Book Reading-Teacher Initiated	0%	0%	0%	7%	4%
4. Book Reading-Student Initiated	4%	2%	7%	18%	14%
5. Student Talk-Response	4%	12%	10%	6%	15%
6. Student Talk	14%	32%	24%	22%	17%
7. Out of Seat	13%	11%	16%	3%	5%
8. Leaving the Room	0%	3%	1%	3%	1%
9. Teacher Involvement	13%	17%	13%	19%	18%
10. Miscellaneous	21	6%	15%	14%	18%

The fact that the results of this study differ from previous research is cause for concern. When using paper and pencil measures to obtain reading interest and achievement which resulted in no significant relationship; gives concern to how best to obtain such relationships. It has been suggested that the measurement of reading interests might have been inaccurate. Research in the future should consider the implications of using such measures as paper and pencil inventories or questionnaires. The appropriateness or inappropriateness of such measures is worth consideration for not only research purposes, but also the effective teaching of reading.

REFERENCES

Asher, S. R. (1980). Topic interest and children's reading comprehension. In R. J. Sipro; C. B. Bertram, and W. F. Brewer (Eds.),Theoretical issues in reading comprehension: Perspectives from Cognitive Psychology, linguistics, artifical intelligence, and education (pp. 525-533). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlban Associates.

Belloni, L. F. and Jongsma, E. A. (1978). The effects of reading comprehension. Journal of Educational Research, 49, 283-288.

Bernstein, M. R. (1955). Relationship between interest and reading comprehension. Journal of Educational Research, 49, 283-288.

Blom, G. E. (1971). Sex differences in reading disability. In E. Calkins (ed.) Reading Forum. Bethesda, MD: National Institute of Neurological Disease and Stroke.

Brewer, W. F. (1983). Form, content, and affect in the theory of stories. The Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 6, 595-596.

Bruneau, O. J. (1986). Comparing the reading interest and comprehension of fifth grade students. Reading Improvement, 23, 100-102.

Campbell, T. K. (1990). Reading interest: A study to investigate the relationship between interest and achievement of male disabled readers ages eight to twelve. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.

DeBeaugrande, R. (1982). The story of grammars and the grammar of stories. Journal of Pragmatics, 6, 383-422.

Duffy, G. G. (1986). There's more to instructional decision making in reading than the "empty classroom." Reading Research Quarterly, 2, 275-300.

Dulin, K. and Chester, B. (1979). The dulin-chester reading interests questionaire. In D. L. Monson and D. K. Monson and D. K. McClenathan (Eds.), Developing active readers: Ideas for parents, teachers, and librarians. Newark, DE: IRA.

Flanders, N. A. (1979). Analyzing teaching behavior. London: Addison-Wesley.

Howe, V. M. (1963). Children's interest. Education,83, 491-496.

Johnson, C. S. and Greenbaum, G. R. (1982). Girls' and boys' reading interests: A review of research. In E. M. Sheridan (ed.),Sex stereotypes and reading: Research and Strategies. Newark, DE: IRA.

King, E. M. (1967). Critical appraisal of research on children's interests, preferences, and habits. Canadian Education and Research Digest,7, 312-326.

MacGinitie, W. H. (1989). Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (3rd. ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Nagel, A. (1990, Winter). The next decade in reading. [Interview with R. Ruddell]. The California Reader, 23,(2), 5-8.

Norvell, G. W. (1950). The reading interests of young people. Boston: D. C. Heath & Company.

Putnam City Schools. (1990). Research on the population of students enrolled in elementary learning disability classes. Putnam City, OK: Author.

Samuels, S. J. and Turnure, J. E. (1974). Attention and

reading achievement in first grade boys and girls. Journal of Education,41,66, 29-32.

Shnayer, S. W. (1968). Some relationships between reading interest and reading comprehension.Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association. [ED 022 633].

Stanchfield, J. M. (1962). Boys' reading interest as revealed through personal conferences. The Reading Teacher,16, 41-44.

Strauss, A., Schatzman, L., Bucher, R. and Sabshin, M. (1981). Psychiatric ideologies and institution. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Terman, L. M. and Lima, M. (1926). Children's reading. New York: Appleton Century Company.

Vaughan, J. L. (1975). The effect of interest on reading comprehension among ability groups and across grade levels, 172-176. In J. Niles (ed.), Reading Convention and Inquiry, Twenty Fourth

Yearbook of the NRC. Clemson: SC. NRC.

Weintraub, S. (1977). Two Significant trends in reading research. In H. Alan Robinson (ed.), Reading and writing instruction in the United States: Historical trends. (pp. 59-63) Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CATEGORIES FOR INTERACTIVE ANALYSIS

CATEGORIES FOR INTERACTIVE ANALYSIS

1. Going to Bookshelf - Child exhibits behavior of moving back and forth to bookshelf for choosing/ selecting reading material. This behavior is at best inconsistent and haphazard.

2. Book and Reading Material Behavior - Child is inattentive to book/print. Turns pages aimlessly and without regard to book; off-task during lessons, activities and tasks, uninvolved.

3. Book Reading-Teacher Initiated - Child reads book in response to teacher command to read.

4. Book Reading-Student Initiated - Child is controlling and directing his book reading. Reads and shows interest and motivation in books, magazines, and other reading material.

5. Student Talk-Response - Talk by student in response to teacher. Teacher initiates, solicits student response.

6. Student Talk - Initiated - Talk by student is self-initiated.

7. Out of Seat - Child is out of seat, not at bookshelf, but in other areas of room such as pencil sharpener, waste basket, and teacher's desk.

8. Leaving the Room - Child leaves the room and goes to get a drink of water, use the bathroom, or goes to school office or nurses office.

9. Teacher Involvement - The teacher exhibits either direct or indirect behavior with students during reading instruction, direct instruction, modeling, and facilitating.

10. Miscellaneous - Other areas not covered above. These can also be pauses or periods of silence.

APPENDIX B

EXIT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

EXIT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Why do you feel that getting a grade for how much reading you do is a very good reward?
2. Why is getting to go to other classes to tell about books you've read is an average reward?
3. How important is it to have your name on the bulletin board showing how much reading you've done?
4. Why would you say that having the teacher read to you in class would not encourage you to read?
5. What is som,ething that the teacher would do to really encourage you to read?
6. What do you think about getting to answer questions about books you've read?
7. How important is getting to write a new ending to a book you've read in your school activities and assignments?
8. When do you think giving an oral book report is appropriate?
9. If you could do anything you wanted after you read a book - what would you do?
10. Why wouldn't you like to discuss in class about what you have read?
11. How important is it to either go and visit the school librarian or have the librarian visit your class?
12. What kinds of pictures are good to make after you have read a book?
13. What would you say is the best reason to read?
14. What would you say is the least reason to read?
15. What could you do to really improve your reading?